Application No. 10/585,868 Docket No.: 13156-00061-US1 Amendment dated October 29, 2009

Reply to Office Action of July 29, 2009

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 12, 13, and 19 have been amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found at least at original claim 2, which is herewith canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Manoharan during the September 2, 2009 telephone interview. The following remarks constitute Applicant's separate summary of the substance of interview.

Applicant appreciates the indication in the Office Action that claims 2, 3, 9-11, and 15-19 recite allowable subject matter and base the amendments herein on this indication of allowability, Specifically, claim 1 is amended to recite the features of claim 2.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As agreed to during the September 2 interview, the amendments herein to claims 12 and 13 overcome the rejection as to these two claims.

With regard to claims 15 and 17, the amendment to claim 1 obviates the rejection as to these two claims.

The Office Action asserts that claim 3 is at odds with claim 2 because claim 2 recites that uncharged molecules are present and claim 3 recites that uncharged molecules are formed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the feature of claim 2, now recited in claim 1, i.e., the recitation of an equilibrium, includes the formation as well as the consumption of chemical compounds. By contrast, claim 3 recites a formation by protonation or alkylation, which is a recitation of an additional claim feature, setting forth how the formation is accomplished.

Application No. 10/585,868 Docket No.: 13156-00061-US1

Amendment dated October 29, 2009 Reply to Office Action of July 29, 2009

Claims 1, 4-8 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,939,974 to Earle et al. or over U.S. Patent No. 6,774,240 to Seddon et al.

As appreciated by the Examiner, neither Earle nor Seddon can reasonably be considered to suggest that cations, anions and uncharged molecules are present in equilibrium in the ionic liquid, as recited in original claim 2.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 13156-00061-US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: October 29, 2009 Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Georg M. Hasselmann/ Georg M. Hasselmann Registration No.: 62,324 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP 1875 Eye Street, NW Suite 1100 Washington, DC 20006 (202) 331-7111 (202) 293-6229 (Fax) Attorney for Applicant